

TO WHAT END(S): POVERTY MAPPING, POVERTY ANALYSIS, POVERTY POLICY, POVERTY ALLEVIATION AND REDUCTION

(Annotated Lecture Outline)

Reginald Herbold Green

I. WHY ARE POVERTY STUDIES A GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT SECTOR?

A. Some Elements

1. Pursuit of knowledge (Of what? How? For what use?)
2. Pursuit of debates basically not about poverty (e.g. structural adjustment, participations, marginality of public policy and praxis)
3. Human concern with/for poor people
4. Policy and programme input (present and crisis alleviation/present and future reduction – the first to reduce deprivation and to limit future damage; the second to enhance present and future well being)

B. Individual Motivation/Financial Mobilisation

5. Individuals have all four reasons – often more than one
6. Because poverty study is a growth area probably an additional reason is to access a safe and non-poor career
7. But the policy and programme input motivation dominates the rise in resources made available
8. As a result of the driving concerns of resource suppliers and perhaps the nature and state of knowledge of the topic Poverty Study is dominantly applied, short term and quasi descriptive. There is no pure theory of poverty (not even Nobel Laureate Sen aspires to that) and often precious little in depth causal and systemic or processual analysis. A Household Study if well done tells a great deal about **what** but only by inference (or

stimulation of follow-up research) much about **why**. Therefore it is by no means as complete a foundation for policy as may sometimes be asserted or assumed.

II. WHY THE POLICY CONCERN?

1. **Moral** – ‘Do unto others as you would have them do unto you’, ‘No man is an island . . . ask not for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee’.
2. **Economic** – Poor people are poor buyers, suppliers, payers and tax-payers. If they became sustainably less poor so too would enterprises, sectors, areas and countries.
3. **Political** –
 - a. domestic to voters or civil society groups who are poor or closely linked to poor
 - b. domestic security concerns – e.g. Anton Rupert’s ‘If they cannot eat, we cannot sleep’
 - c. external (‘donor’) in respect to voters and NGOs – enhanced and distorted by CNN (televised disaster) effect
 - d. external – cost of conflict management, fear of hordes of near destitute migrants whether long distance (Europe’s version of ‘swart gevaar’) or neighbouring country (nightmare of risk of new Mfekane). (Political will is not a helpful composite hard-line terms.)

III. POLICY AND PROGRAMME EMPHASIS FOR MAPPING AND ANALYSIS

- A. Need **maps** that lead to ability to identify real people for real programmes:
- multidimensional correlation studies (apart from uncertain mix of cause and consequence) do not
 - simple (simplistic?) tests may work e.g. infant/under 5 low weight plus growth faltering; ditto for pregnant women in Mozambique GAPVU

urban survival safety net for absolutely poor reaching perhaps 300,000 or 20% of urban poor.

B. Need **maps that cover all or most aspects of poverty** not only household personal consumption:

1. personal consumption
2. access to/use of basic services
3. livelihood potential
4. vulnerability (to what?) and access (or otherwise) to safety nets
5. exclusion – gender, land/credit (dis)entitlement, programme design and decision, political process. (In practice not likely to be treated as components of poverty policy but – if at all – as policies in their own right.)

C. For **alleviation and crisis life saving/damage limitation mapping** may be enough

- and perhaps very simple map. If infant mortality in refugee ‘camp’ is over 100 per month then ‘grab’ (into sheltered, known location), ‘dab’ (of food), ‘jab’ (vaccination/inoculation) – not deep causal or holistic elements study – is appropriate, as a first step. No policy can reduce poverty after death.

D. For **sustainable reduction require causal analysis including participatory dialogue** with poor people

1. Why low income?
2. Why low access?
3. What safety net/trampoline gaps? (For which vulnerabilities?)
4. What can poor people with what market, civil society, state support do to reduce identified poverty elements?

IV. NO SILVER BULLETS OR AMULETS OFF AMULETS: MORE A BUNDLE OF BUILDING POLES

A. Productivity Enhancement

- Access Land (use rights system)
- Capital (credit)
- Labour (e.g. bottleneck periods in agriculture)
- Knowledge (extension)
- Markets
 - i. Physical – especially transport
 - ii. Buyers – preferably in competition

B. Basic Service Access/Adequacy

- Health services (preventive, curative, educational, family planning)
- Education (primary and adult)
- Security (standard sense) – police, courts, public servants
- Security (broader) – trampolines and safety nets

C. Gender Issues

- Female headed household (specific exclusions)
- Women (specific exclusions and overloads)
- Universal access disproportionately favours those with low present access (usually including women)
- Some not self evidently gendered topics are in fact very much so e.g. water (female workloads, women's time to earn, girl's school attendance, efficient – for users – design, user maintenance/management structures)

D. Contextuality

- What is now near adequate in access won't be top of priority list (thus need for care in amalgamating participatory priorities e.g. Kagera

Region in Tanzania concerned about security, which is a top priority, but reasonably satisfied army, police delivery on Rwanda, Burundi frontiers and in respect to refugee camps

- Almost all districts have special problems (e.g. baboons/crocodiles)
- If a checklist of priorities is presented care is needed to emphasis ‘other’ is open ended/desired or list will bias response (e.g. under-application to Regional Funds, for village warehouses in Tanzania)
- A totally (or nearly so) unknown or a poor quality service will have low initial participatory input ranking (e.g. primary health in Somalia – not Somaliland – in 1987; primary education and agricultural extension in rural Tanzania in 1990s). Explanation or/and improvement may be needed to get ‘true’ response.
- Urban, peri urban, town and rural poverty profiles/priorities may vary widely – valuing consumption poses severe problems because of household produced/consumed (subsistence) goods, price discrepancies (an urban kilo of maize meal is not for consumption poverty purposes equal to three rural nor a rural litre of kerosene equal to two urban), additional costs or urban life (e.g. fees, transport to work or market, fuel, water)

V. INITIATING, TESTING, REVISING AND DEVELOPING: FARE FORWARD VOYAGERS

- Need for multi programme (holistic) strategy
- Sustainable (and developable) within realistic administrative and financial constraints (state, civil society, user)
- Regular remapping, ongoing dialogue to chart progress identify what to continue, intensify, add, phase down, drop